

# **“THE *ANISMINIC* REVOLUTION” IN AUSTRALIA**

## **THE RECEPTION OF THE DOCTRINE OF EXTENDED JURISDICTIONAL ERROR IN AUSTRALIA**

**Ian Ellis-Jones**

BA LLB (Syd) Grad Dip Leg Prac [Equiv] (UTS) Adv Mang Cert (STC)  
Solicitor of the Supreme Court of New South Wales and the High Court of Australia  
Consultant, Henningham & Ellis-Jones, Solicitors & Mediators, Sydney  
Local Government Consultant, Dunhill Madden Butler, Solicitors, Sydney  
Lecturer in Law, Faculty of Law, University of Technology, Sydney  
Director, UTS Community Law and Research Centre

1997

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements  
of the degree of Master of Laws by Thesis  
Faculty of Law  
University of Technology, Sydney

## **CERTIFICATE**

I certify that this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not being submitted as part of candidature for any other degree.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me and that any help I have received in preparing the thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in the thesis.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ian David Ellis-Jones', with a long horizontal line extending to the left.

Ian David Ellis-Jones

11 August 1997

## **PREFACE**

I first became interested in the House of Lords decision in *Anisminic Ltd v Foreign Compensation Commission* in 1974 when I was a second year Arts/Law student at the University of Sydney. The subject was "Public Law" and the Lecturer one Leslie Katz, Barrister-at-Law. At that time the full ramifications of the case were not apparent. In the years that followed it soon became clear that *Anisminic* was not just another case on jurisdictional error.

I wish to thank my Examiners, the eminent S D Hotop, Associate Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Western Australia, and Professor Roman Tomasic of the University of Canberra, for their insightful comments and encouragement. Sincere thanks are also due to my supportive and capable academic colleagues Dr Stephen Smith, Lecturer in Law, Faculty of Law, University of Technology, Sydney, and Associate Professor David Barker, Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Technology, Sydney - my Supervisor and Co-supervisor, respectively - for their comments, suggestions and other assistance. I also wish to thank Associate Professor Alexis Goh, formerly of the Faculty, and now at the University of Western Sydney, for believing in me and motivating me to embark on the project.

My gratitude also goes to those who offered encouragement on the project and otherwise: my dear wife Elspeth, my three children Fiona, Simon and Peter, my former law partner Bill Henningham PSM, and my good friends Ross Bowey and Danny Arraj, Solicitor.

My appreciation also extends to all my students, past and present, who put up with me during the preparation of this thesis, and otherwise.

And finally, thanks to the inspiring and persuasive Leslie Katz SC, who gave me my first exposure to Administrative Law and the *Anisminic* case.

Ian Ellis-Jones

11 August 1997

# **CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
<i>CERTIFICATE</i>	i
<i>PREFACE</i>	ii
<i>TABLE OF CASES</i>	v
<i>ABSTRACT</i>	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: THE TRADITIONAL DOCTRINE OF JURISDICTIONAL ERROR	
Introduction	4
Lack of jurisdiction	6
Excess of jurisdiction	14
Wrongful failure or refusal to exercise jurisdiction	17
Error of law on the face of the record	18
CHAPTER 2: THE <i>ANISMINIC</i> REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND	
Introduction	23
The trial judge's decision	31
The Court of Appeal decision	32
The House of Lords decision	37
The " <i>Anisminic</i> revolution"	44
CHAPTER 3: <i>ANISMINIC</i> IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA	51

CHAPTER 4:	<i>ANISMINIC</i> IN OTHER AUSTRALIAN SUPERIOR COURTS	
	New South Wales	70
	Victoria	78
	Queensland	82
	South Australia	83
	Western Australia	85
	Tasmania	88
	Northern Territory	88
	Australian Capital Territory	90
CHAPTER 5:	THE APPARENT FAILURE AND IMPLICIT SUCCESS OF THE <i>ANISMINIC</i> REVOLUTION IN AUSTRALIA: THE AUSTRALIAN EXPERIENCE ASSESSED	
	Introduction	91
	Case Study No 1: R v War Pensions Entitlement Appeal Tribunal & Anor; Ex parte Bott	96
	Case Study No 2: R v Connell; Ex parte Hetton Bellbird Collieries Ltd	98
	Case Study No 3: Ex parte Hebburn Limited; Re Kearsley Shire Council	101
	Case Study No 4: R v Australian Stevedoring Industry Board; Ex parte Melbourne Stevedoring Co Pty Ltd	109
CHAPTER 6:	AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH	114
	<i>SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CRITICAL WRITINGS</i>	128

-oo0oo-

## TABLE OF CASES

- Ainsworth v Criminal Justice Commission (1992) 175 CLR 564 ... 62
- Aldridge v Simpson-Bell (1971) SC 87 ... 45
- Anderton v Auckland City Council [1978] 1 NZLR 657 ... 125
- Anisminic Ltd v Foreign Compensation Commission & Anor: *House of Lords* [1969] 2 AC 147 ... 1, 23-29, 37-50, 53, 57, 64, 66, 70, 75, 80, 81, 86, 87, 92, 93, 111-113, *passim*; *Court of Appeal* [1968] 2 QB 862 ... 29-31, 32-37, *passim*
- Anson Bay Co (Aust) Pty Ltd v Bob Blackmore Excavations Pty Ltd (L & E Ct, Hemmings J, No 40014/89, 17 April 1989, unreported) ... 125
- Antoniou v Roper (1990) 70 LGRA 351 ... 80
- Archer v Howell & Anor [No 2] (1992) 10 WAR 33 ... 86
- Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corporation [1948] 1 KB 223 ... 72, 73, 77, 78, 94, 112, 116, 118, 120, 122
- Attorney-General (NSW) v Hunter [1983] 1 NSWLR 366 ... 16
- Austen, Susan, Ex parte (1897) 18 NSWLR 216 ... 103
- Azzopardi v Tasman UEB Industries Ltd [1985] 4 NSWLR 139 ... 13, 112
- Baldwin & Francis Ltd v Patents Appeal Tribunal [1959] AC 663 ... 6, 19
- Balmain Association Inc v Planning Administrator of Leichhardt Council (1991) 25 NSWLR 615 ... 80, 81, 120
- Banks v Transport Regulation Board (Vic) (1968) 119 CLR 222 ... 19, 97
- BHP Petroleum Pty Ltd v Balfour (1987) 180 CLR 474; 71 ALR 711 ... 47, 55, 64
- Blackwoods Beverages Ltd v Dairy Employees, Truck Drivers and Warehousemen, Local No 834 (No 1) (1956) 3 DLR (2d) 529 ... 14
- Board of Education v Rice [1911] AC 179 ... 15, 54, 71, 106
- Bognor Regis UDC v Boldero [1962] 2 QB 448 ... 15
- Bradlaugh, Ex parte (1878) 3 QBD 509 ... 35
- Brettingham-Moore v Municipality of St Leonards (1969) 121 CLR 509 ... 52
- Bristol v Waite (1834) 1 Ad & El 264; 110 ER 207 ... 10
- Bryan v Maloney (1995) 182 CLR 609 ... 21
- Bunbury v Fuller (1853) 9 Ex 111; 156 ER 47 ... 10
- Byron Shire Businesses for the Future Inc v Byron Council & Anor (1994) 84 LGRA 434 ... 11, 14, 118
- Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 963 v New Brunswick Liquor Corp (1979) 97 DLR (3d) 417 ... 119, 122
- Carter & Ors v Drake (1992) 9 WAR 82 ... 85
- CB Investments Pty Ltd v Colo Shire Council (1980) 41 LGRA 270 ... 118
- Church of Scientology v Woodward (1982) 154 CLR 25 ... 1, 72, 73
- Clancy v Butchers' Shop Employees Union (1904) 1 CLR 181 ... 125
- Clarkson v Director of Public Prosecutions & Ors [1990] VR 745 ... 80
- Coco v R (1994) 179 CLR 427 ... 61, 94
- Coldham & Ors, Re; Ex parte Brideson (1989) 166 CLR 338 ... 14, 15, 88, 89, 99
- Commissioner for Motor Transport v Kirkpatrick (1988) 13 NSWLR 368 ... 20, 21, 63, 68
- Commissioner of Motor Transport v Kirkpatrick (1987) 11 NSWLR 427 ... 20
- Commissioner of Police v District Court of New South Wales & Anor (1993) 31 NSWLR 606 ... 20, 22, 75, 124
- Congreve v Home Office [1976] 1 QB 629 ... 20

Cook, Re; Ex parte Twigg (1980) 54 ALJR 515 ... 52  
 Craig v South Australia (1995) 69 ALJR 873 ... 21, 48, 49, 63, 64, 96, 113, 114  
 Darkingung Local Aboriginal Land Council v Minister Administering the Crown  
 Lands Act (L & E Ct, Stein J, No 40078/86, 30 July 1991, unreported) ... 74  
 Darkingung Local Aboriginal Land Council v Minister for Natural Resources (1985)  
 58 LGRA 298 ... 17  
 Darkingung Local Aboriginal Land Council v Minister for Natural Resources [No 2]  
 (1987) 61 LGRA 218 ... 2, 71, 73, 74  
 Davies v Price [1958] 1 WLR 434 ... 15, 36  
 Dickinson v Perrignon [1973] 1 NSWLR 72 ... 14, 84, 98, 99  
 Dietrich v The Queen (1992) 177 CLR 292 ... 62, 84  
 Director of Public Prosecutions & Anor v His Honour Judge Fricke [1993] 1 VR 369  
 ... 81  
 DPP v Head [1959] AC 83 ... 19  
 Drummoyne Municipal Council v Maritime Services Board (1991) 72 LGRA 186 ...  
 117  
 Estate and Trust Agencies (1927) Ltd v Singapore Improvement Trust [1937] AC  
 898 ... 14, 15, 39, 44, 54, 79, 105, 106  
 FAI Insurances Ltd v Winneke (1982) 151 CLR 342 ... 62  
 Falkirk Assurance Society Ltd v Life Insurance Commissioner (1976) 50 ALJR 324  
 ... 15, 90, 94  
 Farmer v Cotton's Trustees [1915] AC 922 ... 34  
 Federal Commissioner of Taxation v Miller (1946) 73 CLR 93 ... 34  
 Federated Clerks' Union of Australia (South Australian Branch) v Industrial  
 Commission of South Australia (1990) 53 SASR 524 ... 83  
 Foley v Padley (1984) 154 CLR 349 ... 101  
 Fuduche v Minister for Immigration, Local Government & Ethnic Affairs (1993) 117  
 ALR 418 ... 112, 120  
 G J Coles & Co Ltd v Retail Trade Industrial Tribunal & Ors (1987) 7 NSWLR 503 ...  
 20, 63  
 Glenpatrick Pty Ltd v Maclean Shire Council (1989) 72 LGRA 205 ... 117  
 Glenvill Homes Pty Ltd v Builders Licensing Board [1981] 2 NSWLR 608 ... 84  
 Greiner v Independent Commission Against Corruption; Moore v Independent  
 Commission Against Corruption (1992) 28 NSWLR 125 ... 19, 74, 84  
 Groenvelt v Burwell (1700) 1 Ld Raym 454; 91 ER 1202 ... 7  
 Hall v Manchester Corporation (1915) 84 LJ Ch 732 ... 11  
 Hebburn Ltd, Ex parte; Re Kearsley Shire Council/Ex parte J & A Brown & Abernain  
 Seaham Collieries Ltd; Re Kearsley Shire Council (1947) 47 SR (NSW) 416  
 ... 14, 16, 17, 54, 56, 66, 71, 78, 84, 87, 88, 96, 98, 101-108  
 Hedley Byrne & Co Ltd v Heller & Partners Ltd [1964] AC 465 ... 123  
 Helman v Byron Shire Council & Anor (1995) 87 LGRA 349 ... 11  
 Hill v Parsons [1972] Ch 305 ... 125  
 Hockey v Yelland (1984) 157 CLR 124 ... 20, 21, 58, 59, 86, 96, 125  
 Holroyd Municipal Council v Allis Spares & Equipment Pty Ltd (1968) 16 LGRA 265  
 ... 14  
 Hope v Bathurst City Council (1980) 144 CLR 1 ... 34  
 Hot Holdings Pty Ltd v Creasy & Ors (1996) 134 ALR 469 ... 19  
 Houssein v Under Secretary of Industrial Relations and Technology (NSW) (1982)  
 148 CLR 88 ... 55, 58, 59, 86

Howells, *Ex parte*; *Re McCulloch* (1949) 49 SR (NSW) 238 ... 99

Hughes Boat Works Inc and International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural and Implement Workers of America (UAW) Local 1620 et al, *Re* (1980) 26 OR (2d) 420 ... 115, 118, 124, 125

Johns v Australian Securities Commission & Ors (1993) 67 ALJR 850 ... 97

Kelly v Sweeney [1975] 2 NSWLR 720 ... 92

Kioa v West (1985) 159 CLR 550 ... 19, 62, 97

Kriticos v State of New South Wales & Anor (NSW Court of Appeal, Kirby P, Priestley & Powell JJA, 2 February 1996, unreported) ... 22

Kruse v Johnson [1898] 2 QB 91 ... 122

Kydd v Liverpool Watch Committee [1908] AC 327 ... 103

Legal & General Life of Australia Ltd & Anor v North Sydney Municipal Council & Anor (1989) 68 LGRA 192 ... 119

Life Savers (Australasia) Ltd v Frigmobile Pty Ltd [1983] 1 NSWLR 431 ... 92

Local Government Board v Arlidge [1915] AC 120 ... 98

McLoughlin v O'Brian [1983] 1 AC 410 ... 123

Macksville & District Hospital v Mayze (1987) 10 NSWLR 708 ... 71

Mahon v Air New Zealand Ltd (1983) 50 ALR 193 ... 81

Malcolm on behalf of Maryland Residents Group v Newcastle City Council (1991) 73 LGRA 356 ... 117

Maradana Mosque Trustees v Mahmud [1967] 1 AC 13 ... 32, 35, 44

Marshalsea, Case of the (1612) 10 Co Rep 68b; 77 ER 1027 ... 8

Martin, *Ex parte* (1923) 23 SR 411 ... 106

Maxwell v Department of Trade [1974] 1 QB 523 ... 123

Metropolitan Life Insurance Co v International Union of Operating Engineers [1970] SCR 425 ... 15

Minister for Aboriginal Affairs v Peko-Wallsend Ltd (1986) 162 CLR 24 ... 117

Minister for Corrective Services, *Ex parte* (1993) 9 WAR 534 ... 87, 98, 108

Minister for Immigration & Ethnic Affairs v Teo (1995) 57 FCR 194 ... 11, 112, 113, 116

Moodie, *Re*; *Ex parte Emery* (1981) 55 ALJR 387 ... 52

Moss, *Ex parte*; *Re Board of Fire Commissioners of New South Wales* (1961) 61 SR (NSW) 597 ... 12

Murphyores Inc Pty Ltd v Commonwealth of Australia (1976) 136 CLR 1 ... 15, 90, 94

NSW Associated Blue-Metal Quarries Ltd v Federal Commissioner of Taxation (1956) 94 CLR 509 ... 124

New Zealand Engineering and Associated Trades Union v Court of Arbitration [1976] 2 NZLR 283 ... 32, 44

O'Reilly v Mackman [1983] 2 AC 237 ... 45, 48, 55, 64, 82

Oshlack v Richmond River Shire Council (1993) 82 LGRA 222 ... 117

Osmond v Public Service Board of New South Wales [1984] 3 NSWLR 447 ... 72, 73

Our Town FM Pty Ltd v Australian Broadcasting Tribunal [No 1] (1987) 77 ALR 577 ... 93

Padfield v Minister of Agriculture Fisheries and Food [1968] AC 997 ... 20, 80

Parisienne Basket Shoes Pty Ltd v Whyte (1938) 59 CLR 369 ... 6, 8, 9, 12, 53

Parker v R (1963) 111 CLR 610 ... 92

Pearlman v Keepers and Governors of Harrow School [1979] QB 56 ... 42, 50, 60,



77, 94, 108, 115

Penrith City Council v Waste Management Authority (1990) 71 LGRA 376 ... 117

Permanent Trustee Co of NSW Ltd v Campbelltown Municipal Council (1960) 105 CLR 401 ... 5, 11, 93

Piper v St Marylebone Licensing Justices [1928] 2 KB 221 ... 103

Piro v W Foster & Co Ltd (1943) 68 CLR 313 ... 92

Port Arthur Shipbuilding Co v Arthurs (1968) 70 DLR (2d) 693 ... 14

Potter v Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board (1957) 98 CLR 337 ... 5, 7, 93

Prasad v Minister for Immigration & Ethnic Affairs (1985) 65 ALR 549 ... 120

Public Service Association of South Australia v Federated Clerks' Union of Australia, South Australian Branch (1991) 173 CLR 132 ... 6, 15, 17, 76, 84, 85, 86, 87, 95, 98, 108

Public Service Board of New South Wales v Osmond (1986) 159 CLR 656 ... 20, 51, 56

Punton v Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance (No 2) [1964] 1 WLR 226 ... 19

Queensland Electricity Commission & Ors, Re; Ex parte Electrical Trades Union of Australia (1987) 72 ALR 1 ... 55, 56

R v Agricultural Land Tribunal; Ex parte Bracey [1960] 1 WLR 911 ... 15

R v Agricultural Land Tribunal (South Eastern Area); Ex parte Hooker [1952] 1 KB 1 ... 103

R v Australian Broadcasting Tribunal; Ex parte Hardiman (1980) 144 CLR 45 ... 93

R v Australian Broadcasting Tribunal; Ex parte 2HD Pty Ltd (1980) 144 CLR 45 ... 93

R v Australian Stevedoring Industry Board; Ex parte Melbourne Stevedoring Co Pty Ltd (1953) 88 CLR 100 ... 5, 13, 66, 74, 75, 76, 88, 89, 93, 96, 109, 112, 127

R v BBC; Ex parte Lavelle [1983] 1 WLR 23 ... 19

R v Bjelke-Petersen; Ex parte Plunkett [1978] Qd R 305 ... 82, 84

R v Blakeley; Ex parte Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors & Draughtsmen of Australia (1950) 82 CLR 54 ... 9, 74, 82, 88, 89

R v Board of Education [1910] 2 KB 165 ... 105, 106

R v Bolton (1841) 1 QB 66; 113 ER 1054 ... 9

R v Booth; Ex parte Administrative and Clerical Officers' Association (1978) 141 CLR 257 ... 15, 52

R v Chairman of General Sessions at Hamilton; Ex parte Atterby [1959] VR 800 ... 79

R v City Panel on Take-overs and Mergers; Ex parte Datafin plc [1987] 1 All ER 564 ... 19

R v Collins; Ex parte ACTU-Solo Enterprises Pty Ltd (1976) 8 ALR 691 ... 19

R v Commissioners for Special Purposes of the Income Tax (1888) 21 QBD 313 ... 11

R v Connell; Ex parte Hetton Bellbird Collieries Ltd (1944) 69 CLR 407 ... 5, 13, 15, 54, 67, 74, 78, 86, 88, 89, 96, 98-101, 105, 106, 108

R v Cook; Ex parte Twigg (1980) 147 CLR 15 ... 20

R v Cotham [1898] 1 QB 802 ... 104

R v Criminal Injuries Compensation Board; Ex parte Lain [1967] 2 QB 864 ... 19

R v District Court of the Metropolitan District; Ex parte White (1966) 116 CLR 644 ... 20

R v District Court of the Queensland Northern District; Ex parte Thompson (1968) 118 CLR 488 ... 20  
 R v Dixon; Ex parte Ridler (1993) 2 Tas R 42 ... 88  
 R v Dunphy; Ex parte Maynes (1978) 139 CLR 482 ... 15, 16, 52, 54, 71, 107, 116  
 R v Electricity Commissioners; Ex parte London Electricity Joint Committee Co (1920) Ltd [1924] 1 KB 171 ... 19  
 R v Evatt; Ex parte Master Builders Association of NSW [No 2] (1974) 132 CLR 150 ... 52  
 R v Foster; Ex parte Crown Crystal Co Pty Ltd (1944) 69 CLR 299 ... 86  
 R v Fulham, Hammersmith and Kensington Rent Tribunal; Ex parte Hierowski [1953] 2 QB 147 ... 32, 35, 39, 44  
 R v Gray & Ors; Ex parte Marsh & Anor (1985) 157 CLR 357 ... 52, 55, 58, 59, 61, 76, 86, 87  
 R v Greater Manchester Coroner; Ex parte Tal [1984] 3 WLR 643 ... 45, 49, 55, 64, 82  
 R v Hickman; Ex parte Fox and Clinton (1945) 70 CLR 598 ... 54  
 R v HM Treasury [1985] 1 All ER 589 ... 73  
 R v Hull University Visitor; Ex parte Page [1993] AC 682 ... 18, 45, 49, 50  
 R v Industrial Commission of South Australia; Ex parte Adelaide Milk Supply Co-operative Ltd [No 2] (1978) 18 SASR 65 ... 83  
 R v Industrial Commission of South Australia; Ex parte Minda Homes Inc (1975) 11 SASR 333 ... 15, 83, 94  
 R v Inhabitants in Glamorganshire (1700) 1 Ld Raym 580; 91 ER 1287 ... 7  
 R v Insurance Commissioner; Ex parte Saltergate Insurance Co Ltd (1976) 12 ACTR 1 ... 90, 94  
 R v Intervention Board for Agricultural Produce; Ex parte E D & F Man (Sugar) Ltd [1986] 2 All ER 115 ... 121  
 R v Joske; Ex parte Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association (1976) 135 CLR 194 ... 52  
 R v Knightsbridge Crown Court; Ex parte International Sporting Club (London) Ltd [1982] QB 304 ... 19  
 R v Liquor Commission of the Northern Territory & Ors; Ex parte Pitjantjatjara Council Inc & Anor (1984) 31 NTR 13 ... 88  
 R v Ludlow; Ex parte Bamsley Corporation [1947] 1 KB 634 ... 12  
 R v Minister of Health [1939] 1 KB 232 ... 82, 99, 105  
 R v Minister of Housing and Local Government; Ex parte Chichester RDC [1960] 1 WLR 587 ... 15, 54, 71  
 R v Nat Bell Liquors Ltd [1922] 2 AC 128 ... 67  
 R v Nicholson (1899) 2 QB 455 ... 98  
 R v Northumberland Compensation Appeal Tribunal; Ex parte Shaw [1951] 1 KB 711; affirmed by the Court of Appeal [1952] 1 KB 338 ... 18, 19, 77  
 R v Paddington and St Marylebone Rent Tribunal; Ex parte Kendal Hotels Ltd [1947] 1 All ER 448 ... 15  
 R v St George's, Southwark, Vestry (1887) 19 QBD 533 ... 106  
 R v Secretary of State for the Environment Ex parte Ostler [1977] 1 QB 122 ... 49  
 R v Shoreditch Assessment Committee [1910] 2 KB 859 ... 12, 35  
 R v Small Claims Tribunal; Ex parte Amos [1978] Qd R 127 ... 14, 82  
 R v Small Claims Tribunal and Syme; Ex parte Barwiner Nominees Pty Ltd [1975] VR 831 ... 78, 99

R v Southampton Justices; Ex parte Corker (1976) *The Times*, 12 February 1976 ... 45  
 R v Southampton Justices; Ex parte Green [1976] QB 11 ... 45  
 R v Surrey Coroner; Ex parte Campbell [1982] QB 661 ... 47  
 R v Thomas & Ors; Ex parte Sheldons Consolidated Pty Ltd [1982] VR 617 ... 79  
 R v Toohey; Ex parte Northern Land Council (1981) 151 CLR 170 ... 14, 82, 87, 99, 108  
 R v Wakefield (1758) 2 Kenny 164; 96 ER 1143 ... 9  
 R v War Pensions Entitlement Appeal Tribunal & Anor; Ex parte Bott (1933) 50 CLR 228 ... 15, 54, 71, 84, 87, 96-98, 101, 103, 105, 106, 108  
 R v Ward; Ex parte Bowering (1978) 20 SASR 424 ... 83  
 Racal Communications, Re [1981] AC 374 ... 1, 2, 44, 50, 55, 58, 64, 73, 82  
 Racecourse Betting Control Board v Secretary of State for Air [1944] Ch 114 ... 18  
 Redgrave, Ex parte; Re Bennett (1945) 46 SR (NSW) 122 ... 12  
 Ridge v Baldwin [1964] AC 40 ... 19, 63, 71, 80, 81, 97  
 Rosemount Estates Pty Ltd v Cleland & Ors (1995) 86 LGERA 1 ... 77, 93  
 S C M (United Kingdom) Ltd v W J Whittall & Son Ltd [1971] 1 QB 337 ... 127  
 St Vincent & Ors, Ex parte; Medical Board of WA (1989) 2 WAR 279 ... 15  
 Seereelall Jhuggroo v Central Arbitration and Control Board [1953] AC 151 ... 15, 32, 39, 44  
 Service Employees' International Union, Local No 333 v Nipawin District Staff Nurses Association et al (1975) 41 DLR (3d) 6 ... 116, 119  
 Shaw, Re; Ex parte Shaw (1981) 55 ALJR 12 ... 15, 52  
 Silk, Ex parte; Re Chapman Engine Distributors Pty Ltd (1939) 39 SR (NSW) 42 ... 12  
 Sinclair v Mining Warden at Maryborough (1975) 132 CLR 473 ... 15, 16, 74, 88, 89  
 Smith v The Queen (1878) LR 3 App Cas 614 ... 97  
 South Australia v Tanner (1989) 166 CLR 161 ... 121  
 South East Asia Fire Bricks Sdn Bhd v Non-Metallic Mineral Products Manufacturing Employees Union [1981] AC 374 ... 23, 58  
 Staples, In re; Ex parte Australian Telecommunications Commission (1980) 54 ALJR 507 ... 52  
 State of New South Wales v Canellis & Ors (1994) 181 CLR 309 ... 62  
 State of New South Wales & Ors v Macquarie Bank Ltd (1992) 30 NSWLR 307 ... 121, 122  
 State of South Australia v Judge Russell & Anor (1994) 62 SASR 288 ... 84  
 Strathfield Municipal Council v Alpha Plastics Pty Ltd (1988) 66 LGRA 124 ... 125  
 Swist v Alberta Assessment Appeal v Board [1976] 1 WWR 204 ... 124  
 Szelagowicz v Stocker (1994) 35 ALD 16 ... 101  
 Terry v Huntington (1680) Hardres 480; 145 ER 557 ... 6, 7, 8  
 Thelander v Woodward & Anor [1981] 1 NSWLR 644 ... 70  
 Thompson v Randwick Municipal Council (1950) 81 CLR 87 ... 80, 111, 124  
 Toronto Newspaper Guild v Globe Printing Co (1953) 3 DLR 561 ... 15, 71  
 Videto v Minister for Immigration & Ethnic Affairs [No 2] (1985) 8 ALN 238 ... 120  
 Walker v Industrial Court of NSW & Anor (1994) 53 IR 121 ... 14, 75, 99  
 Warringah Shire Council & Ors v Pittwater Provisional Council (1992) 76 LGRA 231 ... 80  
 Weaver v Price (1832) 3 B & Ad 409; 110 ER 147 ... 10  
 Welch v Nash (1807) 8 East 394; 103 ER 394 ... 7

Western Australian Museum & Anor v Information Commissioner (1994) 12 WAR  
 417 ... 87  
 Western Australian Trotting Association & Ors, Re; Ex parte Chambers (1992) 9  
 WAR 178 ... 85  
 Westminster Corporation v London and North Western Railway Co [1905] AC 426  
 ... 80  
 White and Collins v Minister of Health [1939] 2 KB 838 ... 10  
 Williams v Melbourne Corporation (1933) 49 CLR 142 ... 122  
 Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council v Minister Administering the Crown Land Act  
 (1991) 72 LGRA 149 ... 74  
 Wurth, Ex parte; Re Flanagan (1958) 58 SR (NSW) 51 ... 7  
 Wurth, Ex parte; Re Tully (1954) 55 SR (NSW) 47 ... 5, 7, 12, 125  
 X v Amalgamated Television Services Pty Ltd (No 2) (1987) 9 NSWLR 575 ... 92  
 Yadle Investments Pty Ltd v Roads and Traffic Authority of NSW; Roads and Traffic  
 Authority of NSW v Minister for Planning (1989) 72 LGRA 409 ... 18

-oo0oo-

# ABSTRACT

The thesis investigates the so-called "*Anisminic* revolution" in Australia, that is, the reception of the doctrine of extended jurisdictional in this country, and explores the reasons why a case which has had such a profound impact upon English law - a "legal landmark" - has been almost totally ignored by Australian superior courts.

The seeds of the *Anisminic* revolution were sown long before it was held that the Foreign Compensation Commission had exceeded its jurisdiction in not treating as established the *Anisminic* company's claim for compensation. If, as things turned out, the House of Lords in *Anisminic Ltd v Foreign Compensation Commission & Anor*<sup>1</sup> widened the field of judicial review for jurisdictional error, their Lordships did so in the sense of preferring one of two long competing lines of judicial authority to the other.

The traditional doctrine of jurisdictional error which, in its modern form, can be traced from the 17th century, is first explored. A jurisdictional error, in traditional terms, is of three kinds:

1. A want (or lack) of jurisdiction: that is, there is an absence of power or authority on the part of the decision-maker to make the decision.
2. An excess of jurisdiction: that is, the decision is within the general power or authority of the decision-maker, but there is a lack of jurisdiction occurring somewhere throughout the decision-making process itself.
3. A wrongful failure or refusal to exercise jurisdiction: that is, there is no lack or excess of jurisdiction, but simply no exercise of it.

A non-jurisdictional error of law (being an error made *within* jurisdiction), in traditional terms, is any other error of law. Errors made with respect to matters *within* jurisdiction - whether of fact or law - were always seen as unreviewable (in the absence of some statutory right of appeal) *unless* the original decision-maker

---

<sup>1</sup> [1969] 2 AC 147.

had made an error of law which was apparent “on the face of the record”.

In England, the distinction between jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional errors of law was, for all practical purposes, abolished as a result of the House of Lords decision in *Anisminic*. The effect of the majority’s reasoning in that case was to “extend” the traditional concept of jurisdictional error so as to embrace errors of law not traditionally thought to go to jurisdiction, namely, errors of law of the kind subsumed within broad or extended ultra vires (eg the taking into account of irrelevant considerations, manifest unreasonableness).

The result of the *Anisminic* decision in England - which, interestingly, was not immediately apparent when the decision was first handed down - was that every error of law, even in the absence of a statutory right of review or appeal, became prima facie reviewable at common law. The decision has conferred upon a reviewing court, purportedly exercising “supervisory jurisdiction”, such wide powers of judicial review that its role arguably has become more appellate than supervisory.

In Australia, despite some intermittent enthusiasm for the *Anisminic* doctrine of “extended jurisdictional error”, the fact is that most Australian superior courts continue to maintain, or at least pay lip-service to, a distinction between jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional errors of law.

There would appear to be a number of reasons why the Australian courts generally have been reluctant to *formally* embrace the *Anisminic* doctrine of extended jurisdictional error.

Perhaps the main reason is that, for the most part, Australian courts have found the decision unnecessary, having already developed their own liberal interpretation of the traditional doctrine of jurisdictional error.

Using their own “local” version of the *Anisminic* principle - which was well in place before the House of Lords decision in *Anisminic* - and drawing on much the same line of authority relied upon by the majority Lords in *Anisminic*, Australian superior courts have been able to categorise virtually every error of law as jurisdictional and intervene and strike down any exercise of power which they deem to be an abuse

of power just as easily as their British counterparts.

The Australian courts, for the most part, have been content to proceed on a case-by-case basis, guided only by such nebulous and self-serving parameters as “misconstruing the statute the source of jurisdiction”, “misconceiving one’s duty”, “failing to comply with some requirement essential to its valid or effectual performance”, “not applying oneself to the question which the law prescribes”, “misunderstanding the nature of the opinion to be formed” and “being actuated by extraneous considerations”, all of which are readily capable of manipulation and therefore uncertain in their application.

The thesis traces the development and promulgation of this distinctively Australian approach to jurisdictional error through four pre-*Anisminic* Australian cases<sup>2</sup> and attests to the judicial reality that there is a considerable body of case law to support the proposition that *Anisminic* has, in fact, been *impliedly* accepted by most Australian superior courts.

The writer submits that since:

- \* no satisfactory test has ever been devised for distinguishing between jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional errors of law;
- \* a reviewing court can quite easily transmute an error of law in its mind into one of jurisdiction if of the opinion that the error is a “serious” one justifying judicial intervention, whether using the traditional doctrine or otherwise; and
- \* abolition of the distinction arguably would have little or no practical impact on the existing practice of most Australian superior courts,

no useful purpose is served in continuing to pay lip-service to the traditional doctrine of jurisdictional error with its hair-splitting distinction between jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional errors of law.

---

<sup>2</sup> *R v War Pensions Entitlement Appeal Tribunal & Anor; Ex parte Bott* (1933) 50 CLR 228; *R v Connell; Ex parte Hetton Bellbird Collieries Ltd* (1944) 69 CLR 407; *Ex parte Hebburn Ltd; Re Kearsley Shire Council* (1947) 47 SR (NSW) 416; *R v Australian Stevedoring Industry Board; Ex parte Melbourne Stevedoring Co Pty Ltd* (1953) 88 CLR 100.

However, the then almost irresistible temptation to fully embrace the *Anisminic* doctrine needs to be resisted, since it too easily invites a reviewing court, whose proper role is supervisory only, to impose its own view in respect of a particular matter upon a specialised tribunal which was established by the legislature for the express purpose of dealing with such matters.

Nevertheless, the writer is of the opinion that no inferior court or tribunal *ought* to be able to make a “serious” error of law, that is, an error of law on which the decision of the particular case depends, and that what is needed is the adoption of a realistic, pragmatic and *honest* approach to the question of judicial review in which the reviewing court would enquire as to whether or not the particular decision, or the view of the law made by the inferior court or tribunal, could be *rationaly* supported on a construction which the empowering legislation may *reasonably* be considered to bear.

The test would then become more one of “reasonableness” rather than legal “correctness”, with the reviewing court having regard to a number of policy and discretionary considerations similar to those presently applied by the courts in determining whether a duty of care exists in the context of a common law negligence action and whether equitable relief ought to be granted on the facts of a particular case.

The reviewing court would need to be guided by the form and subject-matter of the relevant legislation. Where, for example, it was clear that the legislature had intended to concede a wide area to the inferior court or tribunal, the court should, it is submitted, exercise considerable restraint. Other “pragmatic” factors which might be relevant to the exercise of the reviewing court’s discretion as to whether or not to intervene in a particular case would include:

- \* whether the alleged irregularity is incidental, as opposed to fundamental, to the actual decision;
- \* whether the matter in question is one on which reasonable persons might reasonably arrive at divergent conclusions;